



3753
aw

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450; or is being faxed to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date below:	
Date: 8/1/05	Signature: <i>[Handwritten Signature]</i>

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:
Baer

Serial No.: 09/814,495

Confirmation No.: 4599

Filed: 03/21/2001

Group Art Unit: 3753

Examiner: Ciric

Atty. Dkt. No.: 021944.034US

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR COOLING ELECTRONIC ENCLOSURES

RESPONSE TO NOTICE MAILED JULY 1, 2005 AND
OFFICE ACTION MAILED JANUARY 26, 2005

Mail Stop: Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is submitted in response to the notice of non-compliant amendment and response to amendment dated July 1, 2005. The Commissioner is authorized to deduct any fees that may be required for any reason under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 to 1.21 relating to this paper from Locke Liddell & Sapp LLP Deposit Account No. 12-1322 (reference 021944.034US).

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the captioned application in view of the following remarks and amendments.

The notice of non-compliant amendment said that "changes to the claims should not be in bold characters." However, nothing in 37 CFR 121 appears to prohibit the use of boldface

characters. 37 CFR 121(c)(2) simply says that added text should be underlined and deleted text should be shown by strike-through. Boldface was used as a courtesy to the Examiner to make the amendments more easily identified. In any event, the boldface characters have been removed. The amendments and remarks presented in the response filed on 04/22/2005 are repeated herein below with the boldface text removed from the amendments.

The response to amendment stated that claims were added without identifying “which ones are readable on the elected species as required.” However, the restriction requirement mailed on July 1, 2002, was traversed in the response filed on July 31, 2002. As noted in that response,

Figures 1 – 5 generally illustrate generic aspects of the invention common to each species disclosed or that may be used in conjunction with any of the identified species and are unrelated to the defining characteristics of the species vis-à-vis the genus. Furthermore, Figure 7 illustrates in greater detail further aspects of the invention that may be used in conjunction with any of the species disclosed and are therefore unrelated to the defining characteristics of the various species.

Following the response to the restriction requirement, all of the pending claims remained under consideration. Since the restriction requirement is believed to have been successfully traversed, no identification of species for the added claims seems necessary.

To move the present application to allowance, the following comments are provided. New claims 20-23 were added in the response filed on 04/22/2005. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20-23 are generic to multiple species. The restriction requirement identified 5 species corresponding to Figures 1-5, 6A, 6B, 7 and 8, respectively. However, as noted in the response to the restriction requirement, Figures 1-5 include components of the disclosed system generic to multiple species. Figures 6A and 6B show a particular airflow arrangements and

Figure 7 shows a piping/valve arrangement. The added claims are generic to at least Figures 1-7.

None of the new claims appear to be readable on Figure 8.